

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application and for courtesies extended during the Examiner Interview conducted on January 8, 2008.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1-4, 10-17, 23-26, 28, and 30 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, 26, and 28, are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 14, and 28.

**Claim Amendments**

Independent claims 1, 14, 26, and 28 have been amended to clarify the present invention as recited. No new matter is added by way of these amendments. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, at least on page 3, lines 7-11.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-2, 4, 10-15, 17, and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by DVB Document AO38 “Specification for Service Information (SI) in Digital Video Broadcasting (DVB) Systems,” March 1998 (“DVB”). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. *See* MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully asserts that DVB does not disclose each and every limitation of the amended independent claims.

Specifically, as discussed with the Examiner during the Interview of January 8, 2007, the independent claims have been amended to recite that a plurality of actions are performed based on the information contained in the application data table, and that the actions performed include all three of downloading the application, maintaining the application, and deleting the application. Maintenance of the application occurs when switching to a service that does not include that application. Thus, the amended independent claims require (i) all three of the above-mentioned actions be performed in dependence on the application data table information, and (ii) that the application be maintained when changing to a service that does not contain that application(s).

Turning to the rejection of the claims, as discussed with the Examiner during the Interview conducted on January 8, 2008, DVB fails to disclose maintaining the application as required by the amended independent claims. In fact, the only one of the three required actions that DVB performs is *downloading* of the application, as admitted by the Examiner on pages 2 and 3 of the Action mailed on October 10, 2007. Thus, it follows that DVB fails to disclose or suggest deleting the application in dependence on the information in the application data table, and maintaining the application(s) when switching to a service that does not include the application(s), as required by the amended independent claims.

In view of the above, it is clear that DVB fails to disclose each and every limitation of the amended independent claims. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 14, 26, and 28 are patentable over DVB. Dependent claims 2, 4, 10-13, 15, 17, and 23-25 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3, 16, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DVB in view of US Patent No. 6,526,508 (“Akins”). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, DVB fails to teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claims 1, 14, and 28. Further, Akins fails to supply that which DVB lacks, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Akins solely for the purpose of teaching electronically signing the application data table for purposes of verification. *See* Action mailed October 10, 2007, page 5. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 14, and 28 are patentable over DVB and Akins, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 3, 16, and 30 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/030001).

Dated: January 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan B. Osha  
Registration No. 33,986  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant